

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action dated April 19, 2007. In view of the foregoing amendments and following representations, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

By the above amendment, claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 2. Accordingly, claim 2 has been cancelled and claim 3 has been amended so as to depend from claim 1. Thus, the above amendments do not raise any issues that have not previously been considered by the Examiner.

On pages 2-4 of the previous Office Action, the claims are rejected as follows:

Claims 1, 5, 6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inamura et al. (USPN 5,097,652) in view of Jones (USPN 5,468,080); and

Claims 2-4, 7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inamura et al. and Jones and further in view of Zelnick et al. (USPN 3,191,356).

These rejections are respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

In the response filed January 29, 2007 it was argued that the independent claims distinguish over the applied references due to (1) a clear difference in the position of the moving means, and (2) a difference in the purpose of the position detecting means. However, it does not appear that the Examiner addressed these arguments in the final office action.

Note, by defining a proper timing of printing by the printing means, the present invention has an advantage in that the positional relationship between the conveying position and the print position can be accurately held at a constant value, which enables correct printing at the desired position (see paragraph [0012] of the present specification).

As will be explained below, neither of the cited references discloses (A) that the moving means (12) is positioned between the print means (5) and the seal means (34), and (B) that the

printing by the print means (5) is started after the position detecting means (33) detects a predetermined moved position.

As shown in Fig. 1, the tension roller 43 of Inamura is positioned between the roller 42 and the printer 45, i.e. upstream of the printer. Similarly, the arm 18 of Jones is positioned between the supply roll 12 and the printer A, i.e., upstream of the printer A.

In the apparatuses of Inamura and Jones, if there is slack in the packing sheet between the printer heads and a heat-seal portion at the downstream side of the printer heads when starting a printing operation, the dimension or distance between the print position and the heat-seal position cannot be held at a predetermined value, which will prevent the printed information from being located at the desired position (see paragraph [0003] of the present application).

In contrast, in the present invention, the moving means (12) is positioned between the print means (5) and seal means (34), i.e. after or downstream of the print means (5). According to this arrangement, the distance between a predetermined position of the moving means, i.e. a contact position with the packing sheet and a print position by the print means can be a predetermined value, thereby preventing a shift of the sealing position (see paragraph [0006]).

Further, the pair of position switches 20a, 20b in the Jones machine is provided for the purpose of turning the drive motor of the supply roll 12 on and off (see col. 3, lines 54 to 59). However, in the present invention, the position detecting means (33) is provided for the purpose of starting printing by the print means (5) after the position detecting means (33) detects a predetermined position of the moving means.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the collective teachings of the Inamura and Jones references do not disclose or suggest at least the above-identified features of claims 1, 5 and 6. The remaining claims are dependent on one of the allowable independent claims, and are therefore allowable at least by virtue of their dependencies.


In view of the above, it is submitted that the present application is now clearly in condition for allowance. The Examiner therefore is requested to enter the above amendment and pass this case to issue.

Should the Examiner decide to maintain the current rejections, then the Examiner is respectfully requested to address the above arguments and explain how the applied references read on the above-identified claim limitations. This information is necessary to permit Applicant to judge the advisability of an appeal.

In the event that the Examiner has any comments or suggestions of a nature necessary to place this case in condition for allowance, then the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney by telephone to promptly resolve any remaining matters.

Respectfully submitted,

Shoji YUYAMA et al.

By: 
Michael S. Huppert
Registration No. 40,268
Attorney for Applicants

MSH/kjf
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
September 18, 2007